

Office Action, page 2.

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement for at least the reason set forth below. However, to be fully responsive, Applicant elects, with traverse, the subject matter of Group I, claims 1-22, for prosecution on the merits.

For a restriction requirement to be proper, the Examiner must show that a serious burden exists if all claims are examined together. M.P.E.P. § 803. All Groups I, II, III, and IV relate to the anhydrous paste as recited in, for example, claim 1. See e.g., claims 23, 25, and 29. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that examining all claims of Groups I, II, III, and IV together would not impose a serious burden.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the restriction requirement and examine Groups I, II, III, and IV together.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 24, 2006

By: 
Ningling Wang
Reg. No. 52,412